DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 030 CG 014 270

AUTHOR Lindsey, Michael: And Others
TITLE Employment Opportunities: Older Workers versus Women, Minorities, and Younger Workers?
PUB DATE 29 Nov 79
NOTE 38p.: Paper presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society (32nd, Washington, DC, November 25-29, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age: *Discriminatory Legislation: *Employer Attitudes: Employers: Employment Opportunities: *Equal Opportunities (Jobs): Females: Labor Market: *Legal Problems: Minority Groups: National Surveys: Older Adults: Research Projects: *Social Bias
IDENTIFIERS *Age Discrimination in Employment Act Amend 1978

ABSTRACT

One of the primary concerns of many of the opponents of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) Amendments of 1978 was the possible adverse effects of the legislation on other labor force subgroups. Although groups such as the NAACP, the Urban League, and the National Organization for Women did not testify directly in opposition to the Act, they expressed their concern that the impact of the proposed legislation on other groups had not been adequately researched. The impact of ADEA on employers was investigated. Respondents were asked a series of questions on the expected impact of the ADEA amendments on women, minorities, and younger workers in their organization. Larger organizations, where women and minorities made major employment gains in the past decade, reported more expected reduction in opportunities for these groups than did smaller employers. If these expectations become reality, the advocate organizations for adversely affected labor force subgroups can be expected to lobby intensely against any further expansion of employment opportunities for older workers in the future. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184030

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES: OLDER WORKERS VERSUS WOMEN, MINORITIES, AND YOUNGER WORKERS?

Michael Lindsey
Lois F. Copperman
Fred Keast
Douglas Montgomery

CG 014270

Presented at the 32nd Annual Scientific Meetings
of the Gerontological Society, Washington, D.C.,
November 25-29, 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Lindsey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the effect of the ADEA amendments on the employment opportunities of various subgroups of the labor force. Long before the ADEA amendments were adopted, considerable debate had existed concerning the types of policy that might be undertaken in order to enhance the job opportunities of youth, minorities, and women. With the passage of the ADEA amendments a new dimension was added to this debate: will these amendments increase or decrease job opportunities for these groups? While representatives of these various groups, along with representatives from private enterprise, organized labor, and others have quickly taken sides in this debate, little empirical research has been done on the issue. Since the amendments did not go into effect until January 1, 1979, it is unavoidable that much debate has taken place in the absence of careful research.

This chapter describes the results of our analysis relative to this issue. It will be recalled that data were collected by two primary means. First, a nation-wide mail survey resulted in responses from 1636 enterprises; second, a telephone interview was conducted with 258 employers of at least 500 employees each. Because of the divergent nature of these two techniques, the data they yield will be discussed in separate sections. Thus, we will discuss the findings of the mail survey initially and then turn to a presentation of the telephone interview findings. It can be said, however, that even though these two techniques provided different

sets, the conclusions to be drawn from each are quite similar.

For both the mail survey and telephone interview data the following perspective guided the analyses. The employers assessment of the impact of the amendments on various groups of employees was thought to be influenced by the primary activity (line of business) of the establishment, the geographical region in which the establishment does business, the size of the establishment, the age structure of the employees in the establishment, and the extent to which the employees can be characterized as white or blue collar. In other words, we expected the impact of the amendments to differ according to the characteristics of the business establishment and its labor force. Our reasoning was based on the fact that private businesses differ considerably in terms of these factors and there is little reason to believe that all business establishments will be impacted by the amendments in a similar manner. More importantly, it can be expected that the youth, minorities, and women employed in these businesses are likely to be affected differently depending on the aforementioned characteristics of the establishments in which they work.

We shall now turn to a discussion of our findings from the mail survey. We will first look at the variables used to operationalized our perspective. We will then look at the relationship between the region in which the establishment exists, its primary activity, and the impact of the amendments on youth, minorities, and women.

Next, we will present a more indepth analysis of the relationship between the characteristics of the business establishment and its labor force and the impact of the amendments on, in turn, youth, minorities, and women. After this nas been accomplished we will discuss our findings relative to the telephone interviews in the same sequence or steps.

We will then present the conclusions to be drawn from our analysis of both the mail and telephone data.

The Mail Survey Findings

Variables Included in the Analysis

A variety of questions were included in our survey instrument which enabled us to assess the impact of the ADEA amendments on youth, minorities, and women. In particular, five questions constituted the dependent variables for our analyses. Questions 25a, b, and c and questions 26a and b measured the extent to which the amendments were thought to reduce or increase job opportunities for various groups. As inspection of the questionnaire, included as Appendix _____, will show, questions 25a, b, and c measured the extent to which the amendments were expected to reduce the job opportunities for, in turn, younger workers, minorities, and women. Questions 26a and b, on the other hand, assessed the extent to which the amendments were expected to increase the job opportunities for older women and older minorities.

The frequency distributions for each of these questions can be found in Appendix _____ and are included to provide the reader with a preliminary idea of the type of response engendered by each question. Although other questions might have been included in our analysis of the impact of these amdnements, particularly questions 27 and 30, it can be seen that the majority of respondents (according to the frequency distribution for these questions included in the appendix) either did not answer these questions or felt that the amendments would have no impact on the various groups. Thus, questions 25a, b, and c and questions 26a and b

emerge as the primary measures of the impact of the amendments on youth, minorities, and women; as such they are the dependent variables which will occupy our attention.

As suggested previously, there were many factors thought to influence opinions concerning the impact of the amendments on these groups. The first of these were the primary activity of the establishment and its geographical region. The establishment's primary activity was measured by its Standard Industrial Classification (SIC); this information was obtained from Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. In Appendix _____ each of the establishments responding to our survey are categorized according to the primary activity in which they engage. Similarly, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. provided data which enabled us to place each establishment in one of nine broad geographical regions. A perusal of Appendix _____ will provide the reader with a breakdown of the establishments in terms of the geographical region in which they are located.

Perhaps more importantly than the primary activity and region in which the establishment is located, the size of the establishment, the age distribution of its employees and the extent to which its employees are blue or white collar was expected to influence the impact of the amendments on various groups. Question 39 provided data on the number of employees that the responses were applicable to; that is, the number of employees at the establishment which are impacted by the employer's decisions. Question 33 yielded a percentage breakdown of the establishment's labor force according to seven age categories; thus, the proportion of the establishment's workforce in any particular age group could be easily determined. Finally, questions 35 and 36 reveal the proportion of the establishment's work force which is either blue or white collar. The percent of blue and white collar workers,

along with the age distribution of the employees, and the size of the establishment can be found for all the establishments responding the our survey in Appendix _____. In conjunction with the primary activity of the establishment and its region, these latter variables form the independent variables for our analyses.

Amendment Impact and Primary Activity and Region

Our initial perspective encouraged us to expect that the geographical region in which the establishment operates would have at least some effect on the extent to which the amendments would increase or reduce job opportunities. However, when crosstabulation analyses were performed with the nine categories of region run against questions 25a, b, and c and question 26a and b, no significant relationships were found. Indeed, none of the five crosstabulation tables yielded significant chi-square tests. Thus, it appears that the region in which the establishment is located is not related to the impact that the amendments might have on youth, minorities, and women.

When we shift our attention to the relationship between primary activity and the impact of the amendments on these groups the story is quite different. Five crosstabulation analyses were done relating the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) of the establishment to the respondent's answers to questions 25a, b, and c and questions 26a and b. With the exception of the crosstabulation between question 26b ("will the ADEA amendments increase job opportunities in your firm for older minorities") and SIC, all these relationships were quite significant. These significant relationships are presented in Tables 1-4.

Table 1

Primary SIC of the Establishment by the Extent the ADEA Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Younger Workers

ESTABLISHMENT SIC	ADEA Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Younger Workers: Very Much	Considerably	Some	Not Very Much	Not at All	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	0	0	2	8	13	23
Mining	0	1	3	2	3	9
Contract Construction	5	2	24	45	53	129
Manufacturing	9	12	94	106	123	344
Transportation, Communication, and Public Utilities	0	2	20	22	17	61
Wholesale Trade	4	11	30	39	50	143
Retail Trade	10	7	48	98	132	295
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	3	6	41	44	39	133
Services	15	15	124	155	143	452
COLUMN TOTAL	46	57	399	520	576	1598

$\chi^2 = 96.28$
$p = .0007$

Table 2

Primary SIC of the Establishment by the Extent the ADEA Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Minorities

ESTABLISHMENT SIC	ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL REDUCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES					ROW TOTAL
	Very Much	Consider-ably	Some	Not Very Much	Not at All	
Agriculture	0	0	0	3	19	22
Mining	0	1	2	2	4	9
Contract Construction	1	2	15	29	81	128
Manufacturing	4	6	44	98	191	343
Transportation, Communication, and Public Utilities	1	1	12	16	31	61
Wholesale Trade	1	5	24	32	79	141
Retail Trade	4	0	19	72	193	288
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	1	0	25	34	72	131
Service	6	7	64	110	261	448
COLUMN TOTAL	18	23	207	397	935	1580

$\chi^2 = 124.84$
$p = .000$

Table 3

Primary SIC of the Establishment by the Extent the ADEA Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Women

ESTABLISHMENT SIC	ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL REDUCE OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN: Very Much	Considerably	Some	Not Very Much	Not at All	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	0	0	0	5	17	22
Mining	0	1	2	1	5	9
Contract Construction	3	0	11	27	87	128
Manufacturing	3	6	40	99	195	343
Transportation, Communication, and Public Utilities	0	1	9	16	35	61
Wholesale Trade	1	2	16	34	88	141
Retail Trade	4	1	16	55	212	288
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	1	2	23	32	74	132
Services	6	6	52	92	289	445
COLUMN TOTAL	18	20	171	362	1007	1578

$\chi^2 = 137.42$
$p = .000$

Table 4

Primary SIC of the Establishment by the Extent the ADEA Amendments will Increase Opportunities for Older Women

ESTABLISHMENT SIC	ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL INCREASE OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WOMEN					ROW TOTAL
	Very Much	Considerably	Some	Not Very Much	Not at All	
Agriculture	0	0	4	6	13	23
Mining	1	0	0	3	5	9
Contract Construction	1	0	11	31	84	127
Manufacturing	3	9	64	125	140	341
Transportation, Communication, and Public Utilities	1	1	7	24	28	61
Wholesale Trade	2	2	26	43	69	142
Retail Trade	6	7	45	92	142	292
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	0	2	34	52	44	132
Services	5	12	83	190	162	452
COLUMN TOTAL	19	33	276	569	691	1588

$\chi^2 = 86.76$
$p = .005$

The primary conclusion which may be drawn from these four tables is that employers, regardless of the type of business in which they are engaged, do not feel the ADEA amendments will either increase or reduce the job opportunities

for youth, minorities, or women. In other words, very few employers view the amendments as having any impact at all on job opportunities in their establishments. Perhaps the most remarkable finding is that this view is held with respect to all three groups and that employers in all types of endeavors hold it.

While it is true that employers in all types of endeavors view the amendments as having little, if any, impact, a close inspection of Tables 1-4 suggests that three types of employers seem to feel this way most strongly. Employers in manufacturing, retail trade, and services, relative to other types of employers, feel that these amendments will have little impact on youth, minorities, and women. For example, if one looks at Table 1, it can be seen that of all those who answered that the amendments will have no impact at all on younger workers 123, or 21.4 percent, were manufacturers, 132, or 22.9 percent, were in retail trade, and 143, or 24.8 percent, were in services. Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the same pattern.

Thus, we can conclude that although the region in which the establishment is located has no significant relationship to the impact of the amendments on youth, minorities, and women, the type of activity in which the establishment engages is related to such impacts. In particular, employees in all types of activities feel that the amendments will have little, if any, impact on the groups, but employers in manufacturing, retail trade, and services feel most strongly that the amendments will have no effect at all on youth, women, and minorities.

Amendment Impact and Establishment Size, Age of Employees, and Blue and White Collar Employees

In this section we will closely inspect the relationship between the impact of the amendments and the size of the establishment, the age structure of its work force, and the blue or white collar orientation of its employees. Regression analysis will be used to assess the effect of size, age structure, and blue and white collar orientation (the independent variable) on the extent to which the amendments will impact on youth, minorities, and women (the dependent variables). We will look first at the relationship between the independent variables and the impact of the amendments on youth, then at the relationship relative to minorities, and finally at the relationship relative to women.

Amendment Impact on Youth

Question 25a measured the extent to which the amendments reduced job opportunities for youth. Table 5 reveals that the results of the regression analysis with this question as the dependent variable.

Table 5

Regression* of the Extent to Which the ADEA Amendments will Reduce Job Opportunities for Youth on Establishment Size, Age Distribution of Employees, and Blue-White Collar Orientation**

Independent Variables	Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Youth
Establishment Size	$\beta^{***} = -.21$, $p^{****} = .000$
Percent of Workforce Blue-Collar	$\beta = .07$, $p = .024$
Percent of Workforce Between ages 40-54	$\beta = -.07$, $p = .03$

Table 5 (continued)

Independent Variables	Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Youth
Percent of Workforce between ages 55-64	$\beta = -.08$, $p = .03$

*R = .06
**n = 858 establishments
***β = Standardized Regression Coefficient
****p = Level of significance based on an F-test of the Standardized Regression Coefficient (β).

The results of this analysis suggest that four characteristics of the establishment and its workforce will have an effect on the impact the amendments will have on youth. The strongest effect is that between establishment size and the dependent variable. This highly significant relationship suggests that as the size of the establishment increases, the impact of the amendments on youth will increase. That is, in large organizations the amendments will reduce employment opportunities for youth to a greater extent than in smaller organizations. This is not surprising since in large organizations the criteria for hiring and employment tend to be more objective and impersonal than those of smaller agencies; thus, large organizations are likely to embrace the amendments and retain older workers until 70. The implication is that this may reduce job opportunities for younger workers.

Of the remaining three relationships shown in Table 5 only one is positive. It can be seen that as the percent of the establishment's work-force which is blue collar increases the opinion is that the amendments

will not reduce opportunities for younger workers. That is, in establishments with many blue collar workers the amendments are expected to have little impact on the job opportunities of younger workers. On the other hand, both the percent of the establishment's workforce between the ages of 40-54 and the percent of the workforce between 55-64 are inversely related to the impact of the amendments. This is to say that as the proportion of workers in these age groups increases the amendments are expected to reduce job opportunities for youth. However, caution must be used in interpreting these latter three relationships since they are relatively weak. At best they are suggestive of the fact that both the blue collar orientation of workers and their age are likely to be associated with the impact of the amendments on youth.

Amendments' Impact on Minorities

Questions 25b and 26b deal with the impact of the amendments on minorities in general, and older minorities in particular. We shall consider question 25b first--to what extent will the amendments reduce job opportunities for minorities?

Table 6 presents the results of our regression analysis with question 25b as the dependent variable. This table illustrates that of the seven characteristics of the establishment and its labor force which were included in the analysis only three emerged as having a significant impact on question 25b. More importantly, it is the case that neither the blue nor white collar composition of the establishment's workforce are significantly related at all to the impact of the amendments on minorities. On the basis of our data, then, we can say that the blue or white collar composition of the establishment workforce does not influence opinions regarding the amendments and their impact on minorities.

Table 6

REGRESSION* OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL REDUCE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES ON ESTABLISHMENT SIZE, AGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES, AND BLUE-WHITE COLLAR ORIENTATION**

Independent Variables	Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Minorities
Establishment Size	$\beta^{***} = -.22$, $p^{****} = .000$
Percent of Workforce over 65	$\beta = .10$, $p = .004$
Percent of Workforce between 40-54	$\beta = -.07$, $p = .034$

*$R^2 = .06$
**n = 858
***β = Standardized Regression Coefficient
****p = Level of Significance based on an F-test of the Standardized Regression Coefficient (β)

Of these characteristics which are related to question 25b, establishment size exhibits by far the strongest relationship. As the size of the establishment increases the extent to which the amendments are thought to reduce opportunities for minorities increases as well. We saw the same type of relationship when we discussed the effect of establishment size on the impact of the amendments on youth. Thus, the larger the organization the more likely that the amendments will be thought to reduce opportunities for both youth and minorities. However, although the standardized regression coefficient of establishment size is highly significant, its value of -.22 indicates that the relationship is not terribly strong; nonetheless, it must surely be taken into account by policy makers.

Table 6 also shows that as the proportion of the workforce over the age of 65 increases the degree to which the amendments are felt to reduce opportunities forminorities decreases. That is, in establishments having many workers over 65, the prevailing opinion is likely to be that minorities are not adversely affected by the amendments. Thus, resistance to these amendments is not likely to be found in establishments with a high proportion of older workers. However, as Table 6 also points out, as the percent of the establishment's workforce between the ages of 40-54 increases, the amendments are viewed as reducing job opportunities for minorities. For those establishments with a predominantly "middle-aged" workforce, then, the amendments might encounter some resistance insofar as their perceived negative impact on minorities is concerned. Once again, the magnitude of these relationships is not strong; as a result, they must be interpreted with caution.

We can now turn our attention to the extent to which the amendments will increase the job opportunities for older minorities. In Table 7 the results of our regression analysis with question 26b as the dependent variable are portrayed.

Table 7

REGRESSION* OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER MINORITIES ON ESTABLISHMENT SIZE, AGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES, AND BLUE-WHITE COLLAR ORIENTATION**

Independent Variables	Amendments will Increase Opportunities for Older Minorities
Percent of Work-Force over 65	$\beta^{***} = -.09$, $p^{****} = .005$
Establishment Size	$\beta = -.07$, $p = .039$

*$R^2 = .01$
**n = 858
***β = Standardized Regression Coefficient
****p = Level of Significance based on an F-test of the Standardized Regression Coefficient (β)

It is immediately apparent that only two of the seven independent variables are significantly related to question 26b. What is more, the strength of the relationships is very weak. The relationship between the percent of the workforce over 65 and the dependent variable is consistent with that found between this independent variable and question 25b--to what extent will the amendments increase opportunities for minorities. We previously suggested that this indicates that in establishments with a high proportion of its employees over 65 resistance to the amendments is not likely to be strong. Indeed, as Table 7 shows, as this proportion of the work force increases, it is felt that the amendments will increase opportunities for older minorities. Thus, establishments with many older employees are likely to freely embrace these amendments.

Further, it can be seen that as the size of the establishment increases, it is felt that the amendments will increase opportunities for older minorities. We have already seen that in large establishments the feeling is that the amendments will reduce opportunities for minorities in general; however, we now find that it is felt that the amendment will in fact increase opportunities for older minorities. As we mentioned earlier, though, this relationship is not very strong; as a result, the extent to which this relationship contradicts the much stronger one previously mentioned is open to question.

Amendment Impact on Women

Questions 25c and 26a measured the impact of the amendments on women in general, and older women in particular. We will first discuss the extent to which the amendments will reduce the job opportunities for women and the impact of establishment size, age of the labor force, and blue-white collar orientation on the degree to which thisis likely to occur.

The results of our regression analysis with question 25c as the dependent variable are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

REGRESSION* OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL REDUCE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN ON ESTABLISHMENT SIZE, AGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES, AND BLUE-WHITE COLLAR ORIENTATION**

Independent Variables	Amendments will Reduce Opportunities for Women
Establishment Size	$\beta^{***} = -.21$, $p^{****} = .000$
Percent of Workforce over 65	$\beta = .10$, $p = .003$
Percent of Workforce between 40-54	$\beta = -.09$, $p = .009$

*$R^2 = .06$
**n = 858
***β = Standardized Regression Coefficient
****p = Level of Significance based on F-test of the Standardized Regression Coefficient (β)

Once again, the blue or white collar orientation of the labor force is not significantly related to the expected impact of the amendments. On the other hand, the size of the establishment once again exhibits a strong relationship to amendment impact. As was the case with the impact of the amendments on youth and minorities, an increase in establishment size is associated with the feeling that the amendments will reduce opportunities for women. In other words, no such reduction in opportunity for women is expected in small organizations; however, the impact on women is expected

to be much greater in larger organizations. To the extent that the goals of affirmative action programs relative to women are embraced, so resistance to the amendments is more likely to occur in larger organizations.

It can also be seen that as the proportion of the establishment's workforce over 65 increases, the impact of the amendments on women is felt to be small; that is, the amendments are not though to reduce opportunities for women. This same type of relationship held true for minorities as well. As was pointed out earlier, little resistance might be expected to these amendments in establishments with an older labor force. However, the situation is quite different when the percent of the workforce between 40-54 is considered. As Table 8 shows, as this percent increases, the amendments are increasingly expected to reduce opportunities for women. Perhaps it is not surprising that employees of younger "middle aged" workers would feel that the amendments will block opportunities for women; it is possible that lines of promotion and hiring of women would be viewed as being adversely affected by the extension of the working life made possible by the amendments. In any event, our analysis suggests that the older the establishment working force the less likely the amendments will be viewed as reducing opportunities for women.

The extent to which the amendments will <u>increase</u> opportunities for older women--question 26a--is the dependent variable in our final regression analysis. Table 9 presents our findings.

Here only two of the seven independent variables emerged as having significant relationships with the dependent variable. The first of these, the percent of the workforce over 65, has repeatedly emerged in our earlier analyses. Its integration here is consistent with those which were

Table 9

REGRESSION* OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN ON ESTABLISHMENT SIZE, AGE DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES, AND BLUE-WHITE COLLAR ORIENTATION**

Independent Variables	Amendments will Increase Opportunities for Older Women
Percent of Workforce over 65	$\beta^{***} = -.10$, $p^{****} = .002$
Percent of Workforce which is White-Collar	$\beta = -.07$, $p = .027$

*R^2=.01
**n =858
***β =Standardized Regression Coefficient
****p =Level of significance based on an F-test of the Standardized Regression Coefficient (β)

presented earlier. As the percent of workers in an establishment which are over 65 increases the amendments are felt to increase opportunities for older women. The recurrence of this kind of finding leave little doubt that, relative to the opportunities for, in this case, older women, establishments which have a high proportion of older workers are less likely to resist the implementation of the ADEA amendments and are more likely to view them positively.

In this analysis the percent of the establishment workforce which is white collar emerged as having a significant relationship with the defendant variable. As this proportion increases it is felt that the amendments will increase job opportunities for older women. Certainly establishments in which there are many white collar workers appear to embrace the amendments as having positive impacts on older women. The proportion of white

collar workers has not previously emerged in any of our analyses; while its relationship here with the dependent variable is quite significant, it is not very strong. We can say, in any event, that establishments which are primarily white collar are not likely to resist the amendments as far as their impact on older women is concerned.

Conclusions

Our aim in this section has been to inspect the relationship between establishment size, the age of the establishment workforce, and the blue-white collar orientation of the workforce and the expected impact of the ADEA amendments on youth, minorities, and women. Separate analyses of the relationship between these organizational--labor force measures and the amendment impact on youth, minorities, and women were performed. Nonetheless, a thread of consistency was evident throughout these various analyses.

1. The larger the establishment the more employees are likely to view the amendments as reducing job opportunities for youth, minorities, and women.

Not only was the relationship consistently discovered throughout the analyses but it was invariably stronger than any other relationship found. Thus, of the relationships we examined, establishment size has by far the largest effect on opinions regarding ADEA impacts on youth, minorities, and women. Our initial feeling was that the ADEA amendments would have the strongest impact on large organizations; our analyses have shown that, certainly with respect to the impact on youth, women, and minorities, this does, in fact, seem to be the case. Insofar as the goals of affirmative action programs are embraced by employers, our analysis suggests that employees in large organizations are more likely to resist the amendments than their counterparts in smaller establishments.

2. The older the establishment labor force the less likely are employees to view the amendments as reducing job opportunities for youth, minorities, and women.

In all but our analysis of the impact of the amendments on younger workers, the percent of the workforce over 65 emerged as significant. With respect to both the impact on minorities and women, it was found that as this proportion increased the less likely the amendments were viewed to reduce job opportunities. Indeed, our analyses suggested that as this proportion of older workers increased, the amendments were felt to increase the job opportunities for older minorities and older women. In addition, as the proportion of "middle aged" workers (ages 40-54) increased, the amendments were viewed as reducing job opportunities for minorities and women. This indicates that in establishments with a high proportion of older workers, the amendments will not be looked upon as contrary to affirmative action goals. In conjunction with our previous finding described above, we can say that smaller establishments with older employees are less likely to resist the amendments or, at least, view them in a negative light.

3. The Blue or White Collar affiliation of the establishment labor force has little relationship to opinions about the impact of the ADEA amendments on youth, minorities, and women.

Of the five analyses performed, the percent of the work force which is blue collar and the percent which is white collar emerged as significant only twice. The relative absence of a relationship between these characteristics and opinions regarding the impact of the amendments is quite surprising. It suggests that these characteristics do not "make a difference" in terms of any impact the amendments might have. For example, we found that as the percent of the workforce which is blue collar increases the

amendments are not expected to reduce opportunities for youth--in other words, have little effect. Further, a relatively weak relationship exists between the percent of the establishment's workforce which is white collar and the extent to which the amendments will increase job opportunities for older women. Certainly all this suggests that the blue and white collar orientations of the establishment work force are not factors which are associated with opinions regarding the impact of the amendments on youth, women, and minorities.

THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Variables Included in the Analysis

Five questions were asked of those individuals interviewed by telephone which measured the extent to which the ADEA amendments will increase, decrease, or have no impact on the job opportunities for youth, minorities, and women. Question 25 consisted of five parts: question 25a measured the extent to which the amendments would increase or decrease the job opportunities for younger workers, while question 25b measured amendment impact on minorities and question 25c assessed the impact on women. On the other hand, question25d measured the impact on <u>older</u> workers in general and question 25e measured the impact on opportunities for <u>older</u> women. The interview instrument may be found in Appendix _____.

Included in Appendix _____ are the frequency distributions for this series of questions. As was the case with the corresponding questions on the mail survey, most of the respondents seemed to feel that the amendments would have very little impact on opportunities for youth, minorities, and women. Nonetheless, as was also the case in our analysis of the mail survey, we shall use these five questions as our dependent variables in the analysis.

The independent variables which were used in the analysis of the mail survey have their counterparts on the mail interview. That is, data were collected regarding the region in which the establishment is located, its Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), the establishment size, the age structure of its workforce, and the blue-white collar orientation of its employees. In Appendix _____ is a breakdown of the

establishments participating in our study in terms of the number in particular geographical regions and each SIC classification is presented. The size breakdown of the establishments, the age distribution of their workforce (question 35), and the white collar (question 37) and blue collar (question 38) orientation of the workforce are also presented in the Appendix. Each measure represents an indepdent variable used in these analyses.

Amendment Impact and Primary Activity and Region

It will be recalled that only establishments with at least 500 employees were included in our telephone interviews. Such was not the case with the establishments in our mail survey; no minimum size criterion existed for these establishments. When we looked at the relationship between the region in which the establishment is located and the amendment impact on youth, minorities, and women, we found that no significant relationships existed for establishments included in our mail survey. This lack of a significant relationship holds true as well for establishments included in the telephone interview. Thus, we can say that even when one considers only relatively large establishments (those with at least 500 employees), the geographical location of the establishment appears to have no bearing on the impact of the amendments on youth, minorities, and women.

We next looked at the relationship between SIC and the impact of the amendments on the various groups. When crosstabulation analyses were done relating the SIC of the establishment to the respondent's answers to questions 25a through 25e, only one of the five analyses yielded a significant relationship. The SIC of the establishment is related to the extent

to which the amendments will have an impact on older workers in general (question 25d). This relationship is presented in Table 10.

Table 10

PRIMARY SIC OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
BY THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OLDER WORKERS IN GENERAL

ESTABLISHMENT SIC	FOR OLDER WORKERS IN GENERAL, THE ADEA AMENDMENTS WILL: REDUCE JOB OPPORTUNITIES	HAVE NO IMPACT	INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	1	0	0	1
Mining	2	14	13	29
Construction	0	20	10	30
Manufacture of Non-durables	1	18	3	22
Manufacture of Durables	1	19	5	25
Transportation, Communication, and Public Utilities	3	22	7	32
Wholesale Trade	2	9	9	20
Retail Trade	0	15	6	21
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	2	22	9	33
Services	4	27	5	36
COLUMN TOTAL	16	166	67	249

$\chi^2 = 35.53$
$p = .008$

It is clear from this table that the vast majority of employees in each of the ten SIC categories feels that the ADEA amendments will have little or no impact on older workers. For example, of the 249 respondents

for which data were obtained 166, or 66.7%, felt the amendments would have little or no impact. This finding, coupled with the fact that the other four crosstabulation analyses showed no significant relationships to exist, strongly suggests that the impact of the amendments on youth, women, and minorities does not vary according to the primary activity of the establishment.

Amendment Impact and Establishment Size, Age of the Workforce, and Blue-White Collar Orientation

It was our initial intent to examine the relationship between the impact of the amendments on the various groups and establishment size, age of the workforce, and blue-white collar orientation by using multiple regression analysis. However, when these analyses were performed they failed to uncover any significant relationships. This being the case, we then performed a series of crosstabulation analyses. These did yield some significant relationships. Thus, in this section we will describe those few significant relationships which were found to exist.

Amendment Impact on Younger Workers

Question 25a measured the extent to which the amendments reduced, increased, or had no effect on the job opportunities for younger workers. Crosstabulation analyses were run between this question and the nine independent variables--establishment size, the six categories of employee age, and the percent blue and percent white collar employees. Of these nine analyses only two emerged as significant; Tables 11 and 12 present these two relationships.

Table 11

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNGER WORKERS
BY THE PERCENT OF THE ESTABLISHMENTS' WORKFORCE
BETWEEN 25-39 YEARS OF AGE

For Younger Workers, the ADEA amendments will:	Percent of Workforce Between 25-39				Row Total
	0-24%	25-34%	35-40%	42-80%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	2	7	11	10	30
Have Little Impact	22	25	26	15	88
Increase Job Opportunities	1	3	0	5	9
Column Total	25	35	37	30	127

$x^2 = 14.41$
$p = .02$

Table 12

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNGER WORKERS
BY THE PERCENT OF THE ESTABLISHMENTS' WORKFORCE
WHICH IS BLUE COLLAR

For Younger Workers, the ADEA amendments will:	Percent of the Workforce which is Blue Collar				Row Total
	0-25%	26-62%	63-79%	80-100%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	9	13	15	15	52
Have Little Impact	43	36	20	47	146
Increase Job Opportunities	0	1	8	4	13
Column Total	52	50	43	66	211

$x^2 = 23.18$
$p = .0007$

The relationship depicted in Table 11 suggests that as the proportion of the establishment's workforce between the ages of 25-39 years of age increases, the impact of the amendments on younger workers is thought to increase.

For example, of those employees in establishments having 0-24% of their workforce between 25-39, 22, or 88%, felt the amendments would have no impact; for those having 25-34%, 25, or 71%, of the total felt this way. The corresponding percentages for the last two columns are 70% and 50%. Clearly, this suggests, not surprisingly, that in establishments with many young employees it is less likely that employees will view the amendments as having little impact on their younger workers. Employees in such establishments may view the amendments as either reducing or increasing opportunities for youth, but they are less likely to view them as having no effect. Thus, establishments of this type are likely to be more sensitive to the impact of the amendments.

Table 12 suggests that blue collar workers in general view the amendments as having little, if any, impact on youth. We can see that of the 211 individuals responding, 146, or 69.2%, view the amendments as having little impact. Further, as the proportion of the establishment's workforce which is blue collar increases it appears that little change occurs in the percentage of respondents who feel that the amendments will have little impact. Thus, 43, or 82.7% of those in establishments with 0-25% blue collar workers feel that the amendments will have no impact while 47, or 71.2% of those with 80-100% blue collar workers feel this way. In essence, then, we can suggest that very few respondents in establishments with blue collar workers feel that the amendments will have any impact on younger workers.

Amendment Impact on Older Workers in General

Question 25d attempted to assess the impact of the amendments on older workers in general. Crosstabulation analyses were run between this variable and the nine independent variables previously discussed. All these analyses suggested that the ADEA amendments would have little if any, impact on older workers in general. However, only one of these cross tabulation analyses yielded a significant relationship. Table 13 presents the relationship.

Table 13

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WORKERS IN GENERAL
BY THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE
BETWEEN 25-39 YEARS OF AGE

For Older Workers in General, the ADEA Amendments will:	Percent of Workforce Between 25-39				Row Total
	0-25%	25-34%	35-40%	42-80%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	1	1	4	2	8
Have Little Impact	23	21	24	15	83
Increase Job Opportunities	1	13	9	13	36
Column Total	25	35	37	30	127

$\chi^2 = 14.79$
$p = .02$

First of all, the table clearly shows that most respondents feel the amendments will have little impact on older workers. This feeling is most pronounced in establishments having relatively few workers between 25-39; when only 0-24% of the workforce is in this age category, 23, or

92%, of the respondents felt the amendments would have no impact. Fifty percent of the respondents in establishments with 42-80% of their workers in this age category felt the amendments would have no impact. Nonetheless, we can say that most respondents feel the amendments will have little impact; it is certainly the case that very few respondents felt the amendments would reduce opportunities for older workers in general (only eight respondents).

Amendment Impact on Minorities

We can now turn our attention to the possible impact of the amendments on minorities. Question 25b measured the extent to which the amendments would have an impact on minorities. When crosstabulation analyses were run with this variable two relationships emerged as significant and are presented in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES
BY THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE
BETWEEN AGES 25-39

For Minorities, the ADEA Amendments will	Percent of Workforce Between 25-39				
	0-24%	25-34%	35-40%	42-80%	Total
Reduce Job Opportunities	2	9	3	8	22
Have Little Impact	22	21	32	17	92
Increase Job Opportunities	1	5	2	4	12
Column Total	25	35	37	29	126

$\chi^2=12.37$
$p=.05$

Table 15

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS
ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES
BY THE PROPORTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE
WHITE COLLAR

For Minorities, the ADEA Amendments will	Percent of Workforce White Collar				Row Total
	0-17%	18-34%	35-65%	66-100%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	3	12	12	7	34
Have Little Impact	39	37	39	47	162
Increase Job Opportunities	6	8	4	1	19
Column Total	48	57	55	55	215

$\chi^2=12.97$
$p=.04$

Tables 14 and 15 both indicate that the majority of respondents feel that the amendments will have little impact on minorities. Once again we see that when the percent of the establishment's workforce which is between 25-39 years of age is low it is felt most strongly that the amendments will have little impact. We found this to be the case relative to youth and older workers in general, and, according to Table 14, it is true of minorities as well. Of the 25 establishments having 0-24% of their employees in this age group, 22, or 88%, feel the amendments will have no impact. On the other hand, 17 of the 29, or 58.6%, having 42-80% of their workforce in this age group feel that the amendments will have no impact. Thus, in establishments having a small proportion of workers in the 25-39 year age group it can be expected that the amendments will be viewed as having even less of an effect on minorities.

When we look at Table 15 we find that white collar employees overwhelmingly view the amendments as having little effect on minorities. 162, or 75.3% of the 215 respondents, perceive the amendments as having little or no impact. Interestingly, there is little variation in the response among establishments which have varying proportions of white collar employees. About all that can be said is that slightly more of the respondents viewed the amendments as reducing opportunities than saw them as increasing opportunities (15.8% to 8.8%). Still, the overwhelming majority viewed them as having no impact on minorities.

Amendment Impact on Women

In this final section we will discuss the impact of the amendments on opportunities for women in general and older women in particular. We will look at question 25c first and then at question 25e.

When crosstabulation analyses were run between question 25c and the nine independent variables only one of the relationships emerged as significant. This relationship is illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN BY THE PROPORTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE WHITE COLLAR

For women, the ADEA amendments will	Percent of Workforce White Collar				Row Total
	0-17%	18-34%	35-65%	66-100%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	1	13	8	8	30
Have Little Impact	40	35	42	44	111
Increase Job Opportunities	7	9	5	3	24
Column Totals	48	57	55	55	215

$\chi^2=13.54$
$p=.03$

Like the relationship between white collar employees and amendment impact on minorities discussed above, the relationship depicted in Table 16 suggests that a fairly constant proportion of the respondents felt the amendments will have little impact on minorities; that is, even as the proportion of the establishment's workforce which is white collar increases a fairly constant number of respondents felt that the amendments will have little effect. Thus, variation in the proportion of white collar workers does not "make a difference" in terms of employer attitudes toward the impact of the amendments on women.

Question 25e measured the extent to which the amendments were expected to have an impact on older women. Here, two relationships emerged as significant; these may be inspected in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN BY THE PROPORTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE BETWEEN 25-39 YEARS OF AGE

For Older Women the ADEA Amendments will	Percent of Workforce between 25-39				Row Total
	0-24%	25-34%	35-40%	42-80%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	1	2	5	1	9
Have Little Impact	23	20	26	16	35
Increase Job Opportunities	1	13	6	13	33
Column Total	25	35	37	30	127

$\chi^2=18.08$
$p=.006$

Table 18

THE IMPACT OF THE ADEA AMENDMENTS ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER WOMEN BY THE PROPORTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT'S WORKFORCE 70 YEARS OLD AND OLDER

For Older Women the ADEA Amendments will	Percent of Workforce 70 and Over		Row Total
	0%	1-10%	
Reduce Job Opportunities	6	0	6
Have Little Impact	50	28	78
Increase Job Opportunities	27	4	31
Column Total	83	32	115

$\chi^2 = 8.28$
$p = .01$

Looking first at Table 17, we can see that most respondents do not feel the amendments will have any impact on older women. As we saw relative to the relationship between this age characteristic of the workforce and amendment impact on youth and minorities, as the proportion of the workforce between ages 25-30 decreases employees are even more likely to view the amendments as having little impact on, in this case, older women. Unlike those relationships previously described, however, relatively more employers (33, or 26% of the total) feel that the amendments will increase job opportunities for older women. Still, it must be concluded that most employees feel the amendments will have little impact on older women.

If we now shift our attention to Table 18 we can see that the establishments contacted in our telephone interviews had a maximum of 10% of their workforce 70 years of age and older. We can also see that

78 of the 115 respondents, or 67.8% of the total, view the amendments as having little impact on older women. Thus, even if as many as 10% of the establishment's workforce were at least 70 years old, it is clear that employers do not view the amendments as having much impact on female workers of this age.

Conclusions

It has been our purpose to investigate the expected impact of the ADEA amendments on youth, minorities, and women. The telephone interviews have provided the data with which we have assessed the relationship between the following variables and amendment impact on youth, women, and minorities: the region in which the establishment is located, its SIC classification, its size, the age characteristics of its labor force, and the blue and/or white collar orientation of its workforce. The overarching conclusion which can be drawn from our analyses is that the characteristics of establishments with at least 500 employees and their workforces are, in general, unrelated to the expected impact of the amendments on youth, minorities, and women. In the majority of our analyses the various establishment-related variables exhibit no significant relationship to the expected impact variables. More interestingly, when a significant relationship did emerge it was invariably the case that the amendments were expected to have little, if any, impact on youth, minorities, and women.

All this suggests that, at least for establishments with a minimum of 500 employees, little resistance to the amendments can be expected. To the extent that employers embrace the goals of affirmative action

programs, the amendments can be viewed as having little relevance to the achievement of such goals. This being the case, employers are likely to view them as non-threatening to their goals and to adopt them accordingly.